

**Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting
Meeting Summary
April 28-29, 2005
Augusta, Georgia**

The Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs met April 28-29, 2005, at the Augusta Towers Hotel in Augusta, Ga. The Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board hosted the meeting. Meeting participants included Chairs, Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs, other SSAB members, DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) and field staff, site coordinators, SSAB administrators, and support staff. The meeting was facilitated by Mike Schoener of MAS Consultants, Inc. A large majority of the meeting attendees also participated in a tour of the Savannah River Site on April 27.

Participants

- Fernald Citizens Advisory Board (CAB): Lou Doll, Bob Tabor
- Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Shelley Cimon
- Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) CAB: David Kipping, Karen Corrigan
- Nevada Test Site (NTS) Community Advisory Board: Charles Phillips, Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen
- Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNMCAB): Jim Brannon
- Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB): Kerry Trammell, Norman Mulvenon
- Paducah CAB: Rhonda McCorry
- Rocky Flats CAB: Gerald Depoorter, Andrew Ross
- Savannah River Site (SRS) CAB: Jean Sulc, Bill Lawless
- Department of Energy (DOE-HQ): Sandra Waisley, Melissa Nielson, Jay Vivari, Doug Frost, Frank Marcinowski
- DOE- Office of Legacy Management: Audrey Berry
- Coordinators/Administrators/Support Staff: Margret Hinman, Carla Sanda, Menice Manzanares, Dave Adler, Pete Osborne, Dave Dollins, Ken Korkia, William Spader, Gerri Fleming, Dawn Haygood, Gary Stegner, Sue Walpole

Thursday, April 28, 2005

Round Robin 1: Top Three Issues for Each SSAB

Each board was given an opportunity to highlight current issues facing the boards and the sites.

FERNALD

Bob Tabor presented a current picture of the Fernald Closure Project, a picture from six years ago and a future End State depiction. Lou Doll presented the Board's top three issues.

Disposal Site for Silos 1&2 Waste

- Silos 1 and 2 are known as the "K-65 Silos." They held 8,900 cubic yards of low-level, radium-bearing waste generated by refining uranium ore at the site.
- The wastes were recently transferred to four on-site holding tanks, using a sluicing technique. Silos 1 and 2 were demolished on April 15-16, 2005.
- Treatment and packaging facility is undergoing readiness assessments.
- Under amended ROD, waste will be mixed with flyash and concrete and placed in a steel container. Disposal is designated for the Nevada Test Site (NTS) or an appropriately licensed private waste facility. Shipment will be by truck, two containers per trip.
- Due to public and political opposition, Envirocare decided not to pursue waste, which would have enabled rail transport.
- In April 2004, the Attorney General from the State of Nevada threatened a lawsuit to prevent shipment of waste to NTS. To date, there has been little action from DOE to resolve the issue, despite FCAB urgings to do so.

- FCAB pressured DOE to seek alternate disposal sites or opportunities for temporary storage, in order to avoid project delays and manage long term costs.
- Per agreement with EPA, DOE must find a permanent disposal facility within two years. If the waste is sent off site for storage, it cannot be sent back to Fernald.
- DOE is pursuing approval from the State of Texas to store the waste at WCS. WCS is seeking a permit to be the permanent disposal site for the waste.

Post Closure Education & Outreach

- The 1999 Consensus Stakeholder vision for the Future of Fernald designates the future use of the site as an undeveloped park focused on education.
- The 2002 FCAB report, *Telling the Story of Fernald*, explains the importance of education and outreach for continued protection of human health and the environment at the site. The report, and subsequent FCAB recommendations, framed public awareness as a necessary institutional control.
- The FCAB, with support from other local interests, has recommended construction of an education facility at the site and the establishment of outreach programs.
- The FCAB is seeking opportunities to collaborate with EM and LM on achieving this goal. The FCAB has pushed for inclusion of education and outreach in the site's Institutional Controls Plan.
- The FCAB has been involved in preserving artifacts, photographs, videos, and other resources that could be used for education programs.
- In recent years, DOE backtracked from past commitments by local personnel to provide trails and other public facilities.
- Funding for education and outreach is contingent on settlement of a Natural Resources Damages claim filed against DOE by the State of Ohio.

Transition of Site from EM to LM

- Legacy Management is working with EM to craft plans for site transition.
- Completion of the closure contract for Fernald is anticipated in early 2006.
- The FCAB supports accelerated cleanup, but has long prioritized safe and effective completion of the cleanup over meeting an arbitrary deadline for closure.
- Aquifer restoration at Fernald is likely to continue for approximately 20 years after closure.
- For the past six months, Legacy Management (LM) personnel have attended all FCAB meetings.
- The full transition of Fernald management from EM to LM will continue through September 2007.
- DOE currently plans to disband the FCAB in September 2005 (Sandra Waisley stated funding is provided through 2006).
- Congress mandated that LM form a Local Stakeholder Organization (LSO) to represent local interests at closure sites. The FCAB would like the Fernald LSO to represent broad interests, rather than just local elected officials.
- The FCAB would like transition of public participation to more closely match site transition.
- LM has not contracted for long term stewardship management, records management, aquifer restoration, or natural resource management at Fernald.

HANFORD

Susan Leckband presented Hanford's top three issues.

Impacts from Potential Budget Cuts

- Very concerned about 05-06 numbers. See major cleanup slowing down considerably.
- Expect to lose trained skilled workers. Taking a \$300 million cut in 05.
- Don't have wonderful road system in Hanford. Buildings will be deteriorating.
- Milestones in our tri-party agreement in severe jeopardy.
- There will be advice on budget at board meeting going on now, and this is why the Chair is not in attendance.
- Huge economic impacts to surrounding area.

Strategic Decision Making Central Plateau

- 586 square mile Hanford site to be reduced to 200 square mile site.

- Highly contaminated and planning needs to be done. There will be huge caps over waste sites. Hanford has five huge canyon facilities.
- One cap will be the equivalent to football field 7.5 feet high leaving a big hole somewhere else.
- There may be a need for long term plutonium storage and there is nothing in the works to build facilities.
- Waste disposition alternatives need to be identified, and if not, there will be a huge problem.
- The Yucca Mountain delay is a big problem.

Pre-1970 Buried Waste

- Eighteen to twenty times more volume pre-1970 than post-1970 buried waste.
- Containers are deteriorating in unlined burial grounds. Mixed waste in burial grounds.
- HAB requested that burial grounds be characterized appropriately.
- Transuranic (TRU) waste is TRU waste regardless of the date it was generated.

IDAHO

David Kipping presented Idaho's top three issues

Protection of the Snake River Aquifer

- The INEEL CAB is concerned about contamination of the aquifer and supports targeted excavation of buried waste containing TRU waste and volatile organic compounds-single greatest risk. Unclear what will happen with it, no final remedy as yet.
- DOE beginning to excavate small portions, total of 12 acres candidate for excavation.
- Other protective measures include closure of the high-level waste tanks and continued long-term water monitoring.

Contingency Plans for Yucca Mountain

- The INEEL CAB is concerned about the continued delays in opening Yucca Mountain and the effect on the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) plans for cleanup.
- Have a great deal of spent fuel and high level waste in solid form. Much of the spent fuel is navy fuel in wet storage. Navy has built a facility for storing spent fuel above ground in casks and fuel will be moved from wet to dry storage. There is no place for the DOE fuel to go.
- Recommend that DOE make contingency plans for waste under its purview that has been slated for disposal at Yucca Mountain.

Effect of the Nuclear Energy Mission at INL

- All of the major contractors at INL are being changed and overall management of the site is being reorganized using two contractors, one for cleanup and one for nuclear energy.
- This wholesale changeover of contractors has slowed long term planning for cleanup.
- The CAB is concerned about the pace of major cleanup projects such as the high level waste tanks, remaining liquid waste in the tanks, solidified high level waste, and stored and buried TRU waste.
- The CAB is concerned about the utilization of the workforce as they move to these new contractors.
- The CAB is also concerned about generation of new waste, especially from the Nuclear Energy mission. Most of the facilities for dealing with such waste are being decommissioned and closed, and we wonder how the new waste will be managed.

NEVADA

Charles Phillips presented the top two issues of the Nevada Test Site CAB.

Underground Test Area Project (UGTA)

- 828 historical underground nuclear tests conducted at the NTS released ~132 million curies of radioactivity into subsurface regions
- Stakeholders concerned that contaminants may migrate offsite
- Independent peer review of UGTA project strategy conducted
- DOE invited CAB to study issue and provide recommendation for future well siting

- CAB issued a formal recommendation letter to DOE NSO – February 9, 2005 to fund / install a system of 3 wells strategically located down gradient of region where major testing occurred; up gradient of the residents of Oasis Valley, Beatty, and Amargosa, NV
- Formal response from DOE pending
- CAB preparing detailed white paper providing background, rationale for recommendations, and bibliography for submittal to DOE
- CAB continuing to provide status reports to interested stakeholders

RCRA Part B Permit Application- if granted, would allow the NTS to accept and dispose of mixed low-level waste (MLLW) from off-site generators

- Since 1987 the NTS has safely disposed on-site generated mixed wastes in an unlined facility
- February 2000: Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement identified the NTS as one of two sites tasked with disposing both low-level and mixed low-level waste (MLLW) for DOE sites throughout the country
- March 2000 – April 2005: NTS working with the State of Nevada on the permit application, which specifically included plans to use existing unlined mixed waste disposal unit
- DOE asked the CAB to review the application and it formed a technical working group and provided a recommendation to DOE. The permit is progressing and there is promising dialogue.

NORTHERN NEW MEXICO

Jim Brannon presented the top issues for the Northern New Mexico SSAB.

Protection of Groundwater

- We still don't know what's there. No certainty that long term decisions can be made.
- Hydrogeologic plan not yet complete. Groundwater is 800-1500 feet below and the down gradient is Santa Fe, NM. The nature of the geology is not fully understood.
- Don't know if implementation of New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) Order will protect the groundwater in timely fashion.

Implementation of NMED Order and Lack of Funds

- Budget – it will cost much, much more than estimated, has not been realistically addressed.
- Estimates range up to \$700 M shortfall.
- Completion Report Due at 2015 is unrealistic.

Just How Important are the SSABs to DOE?

- Are we valued or should we all go home?
- Most people who serve on boards are sensitive to whether DOE is listening. All the changes and turmoil demand that bureaucracy provide guidance and reassurance to citizens.
- Public Participation Policy has not been published from National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).
- NNM CAB has experienced delays in appointment packages. Los Alamos has been tasked by NNSA to get some things done, but the site manager doesn't have resources to get it done. He has detailed 40-50 employees to other assignments, one of which is the Deputy Designated Federal Officer. The Ex-Officio representative is frequently absent. Need positive feedback on what DOE wants the CAB to do to help.

OAK RIDGE

Kerry Trammell presented the top three issues for Oak Ridge.

Closure Conditions for the East Tennessee Technology Park (K-25 gaseous diffusion plant) for industrial use in 2008

- A classified burial ground will be left in place: appearance, security controls are issues
- TSCA Incinerator will now operate past 2006: a new DOE contractor will be named, incinerator may make site less attractive for reindustrialization, D&D work will be pushed past 2008 closure date

- Historical preservation is uncertain: Memorandum of Agreement is signed, but funding and management issues are unresolved
- Site conditions may hinder reindustrialization: deed constraints will be needed, infrastructure questionable, onsite landfill may make site less attractive

Stewardship

- No clear understanding as to what federal program will have long-term stewardship responsibility; Oak Ridge does have a continuing mission.
- ORSSAB is working to ensure that the necessary stewardship components are captured so that information and requirements are available to whatever program takes on this responsibility

Waste Issues

- Lack of contingency planning
- Lack of disposition pathway to WIPP for Oak Ridge Remote Handled (RH) TRU
- Lack of disposition pathway for some wastes
- As OR looks to changing mission, new waste will be generated and the Board wants to understand the issues.
- The City of Oak Ridge is pushing for a tipping fee or a tax on waste at the site. This has been unsuccessful and they've seen models in other areas and looking to state legislators to try and tax stored waste. Estimate a \$5-20 million impact on cleanup at Oak Ridge. Money would come out of EM cleanup budget. CAB is following closely. Don't want to support a bill if it slows down cleanup. The Board is making a concerted effort to completely understand the impact.

PADUCAH

Rhonda McCorry presented the top issues for Paducah.

Transportation of Waste

- From June to August 2004, several waste transportation and disposal incidents resulted in the need for a standdown.
- A full and thorough review of the Paducah waste program was conducted, numerous improvement opportunities and corrective actions were identified.
- Landfill disposal resumed in November 2004 and off-site shipments (other than to NTS) resumed in January 2005. NTS shipments should resume in June 2005 following re-certification of the Paducah program.
- Suspension of shipments is having significant impact on several projects.

Waste Disposition

- Projects affected:
 - Scrap Metal
 - Wide variety of materials exist in scrap piles
 - DOE Material Storage Areas (DMSA)
 - Ongoing characterization and disposal of material and equipment
 - Legacy Waste
 - Ongoing characterization and disposal and/or recycling of Legacy Waste
- All waste disposition projects are experiencing delays due to recent transportation issues.

Concern Over Award of Remediation Contract

- DOE awarded a \$303 million environmental contract
- Bidders have filed a total of 11 protests
- DOE decided to reconsider both technical and cost evaluations given by bidders in making a new award decision.
- Local leaders met with Bodman concerning continued delays that could potentially hurt federal cleanup funding.

- Bodman has ordered an internal review of the procurement process that has dragged on for more than a year.
- Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC has repeatedly been extended and could be extended again if a replacement isn't picked by the end of August.
- Infrastructure contract- Swift & Staley Mechanical Contractors, Inc. Eleven protests to contract to Northwinds. Bechtel Jacobs has been extended twice – till August currently. Most of the protests have been decided and removed.

ROCKY FLATS

Gerald DePoorter and Andrew Ross presented the top three issues for Rocky Flats.

Future Public Involvement Post-Closure

- In its last session, Congress approved legislation creating Local Stakeholder Organizations (LSOs) at DOE's three closure sites: Rocky Flats, Fernald, and Mound.
- The legislation states that: "The local stakeholder organization shall be established in consultation with interested elected officials of local governments in the vicinity of the closure site concerned" and "shall be composed of such elected officials of local governments...as the Secretary of Energy considers appropriate to carry out the responsibilities set forth...or the designees of such elected officials."
- The elected officials in the vicinity of Rocky Flats have taken a position that they alone will be members of the LSO with full voting rights, while a lesser and unequal role will be created for non-elected persons.
- The official and consistent position of the Rocky Flats CAB is that the LSO membership should include the broadest range of area stakeholders and that all members should have rights to full and equal participation.
- Just received a letter from several members of the Colorado Congressional Delegation on LSO. CAB has remained firm. Sent letters to Mike Owen and Congressional delegation for broad-based participation. Rocky Flats has a long history of public participation. If the CAB is excluded from the LSO, much knowledge and history will be lost and the LSO will not be effective.

Decreased Funding for Other DOE Sites

- When closure sites such as Rocky Flats were first created, cleanup funds from other DOE sites were diverted in order to accelerate the cleanup at these closure sites.
- A selling point for this program was that funding levels at the other DOE sites would eventually be restored once the accelerated closure sites were cleaned up.
- We now are learning that funding levels for the other DOE sites will not be increased proportionately once cleanup at the accelerated closure sites is achieved.
- The Board believes DOE should demonstrate the same commitment to cleanup at sites from which money was diverted as it did to the accelerated closure sites by restoring previous funding levels.

Sharing Lessons Learned

- The Rocky Flats CAB will cease operations once regulatory closure of the site is achieved, estimated sometime in late summer 2006.
- The Board is concerned how lessons learned from Rocky Flats cleanup will be shared with other sites that are still engaged in a cleanup program.
- Important lessons learned also must be shared as the site transitions from EM to LM
- With the transfer of former weapons complex sites from EM to other DOE programs, the make-up of the current EM SSAB will be dramatically altered, which will have a significant impact on the ability of stakeholders nationwide to share lessons learned and address issues of common concern.
- The Rocky Flats CAB believes that some mechanism to allow continuing dialogue between the current EM SSAB members should be developed.

SAVANNAH RIVER

Jean Sulc presented the top issues for Savannah River.

High Level Waste Disposition

- Board is providing input on low curie salt, the actinide removal process, saltstone, waste removal, interim tank and associated infrastructure closure, and salt waste processing.
- The U. S. Congress passed the National Defense Authorization Act of FY05 which included provisions for determining which portions of nuclear wastes do not require permanent isolation in a deep geologic repository.
- Section 3116 allows DOE, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and possibly the National Academy of Sciences, and pursuant to a State of South Carolina permit or closure plan to move forward with salt waste processing plans and tank closures.
- Federal Facility Agreement commitment dates have been revised for the next two tank closures to October 31, 2006, (Tank 19) and February 28, 2007, (Tank 18).

Disposition of EM -Owned Plutonium and Orphan Material Without A Disposition Path That May Come to SRS

- Changes to the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Program during FY'02 led to the cancellation of the proposed Immobilization facility.
- The specific disposition path for this nuclear material has not been determined, but a proposed strategy is expected in the coming year.
- Cost effectiveness and security aspects of plutonium management are some of the issues that are being evaluated and while no decision has been made.
- As DOE continues with accelerated cleanup activities, there remains a small inventory of miscellaneous nuclear materials without a disposition path. The expedited development of a complete, integrated and well-considered plan for the disposition of all excess plutonium is needed to preclude unnecessary long-term storage of plutonium at SRS

Transuranic (TRU) Waste Program

- Approximately half of the 30,000 TRU waste drums have already been shipped to WIPP. High activity TRU (mostly Pu238 wastes) and non-drummed TRU waste remains a challenge, but innovative approaches are being explored to prepare these wastes for shipment. Some of the challenges facing the acceleration of TRU waste shipments include:
- Success of the Modular Repackaging Facility for drum remediation
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval of the TRUPACT III shipping containers in time to support the FY08 completion of legacy TRU wastes
- Regulatory relief on transportation for curie and wattage (for high activity TRU)
- Large container assay and x-ray equipment
- WIPP support of the SRS accelerated shipping rate including transportation resources and certification of large container characterization equipment
- Limited intrusive repackaging for large containers and high curie drum waste
- Utilization of existing SRS facilities for repackaging/remediation of high activity
- Pu-238 non-drummed waste while ensuring worker safety
- Obtaining RCRA Part B permit(s) for closure of appropriate pads

Questions and Answers

Idaho asked Paducah to explain the structure of the two site contracts. Ms. McCorry explained that one is for cleanup and one for infrastructure. Infrastructure will handle day-to-day activities.

Nevada inquired about the funds diverted to the Rocky Flats cleanup program and how much of that money was diverted from other programs. Mr. DePoorter explained that DOE wanted to get Rocky Flats complete and allocated enough money to achieve cleanup by 2006. He stated that now the money is not being reallocated. Melissa Nielson explained that since Al Alm came up with idea of taking money from other sites, there had been a change in administration. She noted that rather than have level funding, DOE increased funding and there was no diversion of monies to Rocky Flats, that everyone got accelerated money. Sandra Waisley commented that Roger Butler had explained this in past meetings.

Savannah River inquired of Oak Ridge what the chances were for passing of the State legislative bill to tax the site. Oak Ridge responded the chances were very good and noted that DOE has not taken a stance at this point. The local contractors are anticipating the impact as priorities for cleanup would have to be changed.

Bill Lawless, Savannah River, commented to Hanford regarding the fact that they have no facility to hold vitrified waste and need Yucca Mountain to open. He asked if the HAB has taken an official position on opening Yucca Mountain. Susan Leckband stated they have not. She noted that Hanford has interim storage but the HAB is concerned there is not a plan B and no facility for long term storage. Mr. Lawless also inquired of Idaho about the huge volume of calcine and future plans for disposal. Mr. Kipping stated the new contractors have not yet addressed the issue and commented that high level waste has to go to Yucca. It is currently stored in a facility good for at least 100 years and no more Calcine is being produced. The plan is to put it in canisters and ship to Yucca, however Idaho will need an exemption from Waste Acceptance Criteria for Yucca since currently, the only acceptable form is vitrified. Mr. Kipping stated it is a long way to getting approved and it's not really a high priority for the CAB, since the aquifer is not in immediate danger. The Board is more concerned about buried waste.

Susan Leckband closed the Q&A session with an observation that the EM SSAB Chairs body are parts of a whole with more in common than not. She noted Hanford expects to learn from this process.

National Dialogue Forum Discussion

Norman Mulvenon asked all participants to read the letter dated April 22, 2005, from Paul Golan (see attachment). He noted his disappointment in the DOE response and stated that this letter is interesting since it was signed by Mr. Golan last week, but he is only acting until May 8.

Mr. Mulvenon introduced Frank Marcinowski, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Logistics & Waste Disposition and asked him to tell the Chairs about his division. Mr. Marcinowski explained that his group looks at transportation and disposition issues across the complex. He said they are working on disposition maps for Low Level Waste (LLW), Mixed LLW, TRU, Plutonium, and Spent Nuclear Fuel and developing strategies on all particular waste types. Mr. Marcinowski stated his group is working with the sites to develop the waste disposition strategy and they should be ready to share something later this year. He noted it was important to get feedback on the issues and the various options. Some pathways for waste disposition noted in the earlier waste disposition maps are no longer available to DOE and they are looking for alternatives. He used orphan waste as an example noting that Nevada turned out not to be an option for Fernald. DOE is being forced into a position where commercial disposal is more prevalent. Contracts for Silo 1 and 2 at Fernald were expected to be issued that day or tomorrow and hoping that will start in late May. DOE is finding alternatives and in some cases being forced into a position where commercial is becoming more prevalent.

Susan Leckband asked what will be available in summer. Mr. Marcinowski stated that a strategy document is being developed and it will be specific and not philosophical. Sandra Waisley commented that an extra \$300,000 had been dedicated to get that work done.

Mike Schoener referred to the draft outline regarding a National Forum (see attachment) and asked the Chairs to agree on a final product by the conclusion of the meeting. He suggested the attendees study the document during the evening and come to the table with showstoppers the next day. The SSAB Chairs agreed to provide the document even though Mr. Golan's letter was discouraging. Bill Lawless noted he had significant issues with the proposal and tended to side with Golan in a number of respects. He stated the document is ambiguous and should better demonstrate what is planned and what issues should be brought forward. He stated the first thing that has to happen for a National Forum to come about is there has to be some relevant issues and it has to deal with things that will help SR accelerate its cleanup. Opening Yucca Mountain is a major issue and if it is on the agenda, he stated he could support the forum. He would like to see transuranic waste on the agenda as well. Regarding sponsorship, Mr. Lawless stated the Forum should be sponsored by the Boards themselves and not an outside agency. The SSABs should

take responsibility for it. He suggested the SSAB facilitators be utilized and an SSAB Chairs meeting expanded to accommodate the forum.

Mr. Marcinowski noted a meeting in Nashville being sponsored by Perma-Fix and noted a waste disposition meeting in late May in St. Louis to begin discussing waste disposition issues with contractors and subs.

Shelley Cimon urged the Chairs to go forward with a forum. She asked if the SSABs get to weigh in on the course changes that DOE is contemplating. She commented she does not like DAD (Decide Announce Defend). She stated that if the objectives and assumptions that went into the original waste disposition maps is flawed now, then the stakeholders need to be weighing in on it. She stated that frankly, it is assumed that much waste will be left at Hanford, which is fine as long as Hanford has the budget and infrastructure to maintain it on site. She said she did not want to see the door shut on a national forum.

Stewardship Education Resource Kit- Oak Ridge SSAB

Pete Osborne provided a presentation on the Oak Ridge SSAB Stewardship Resource Kit (see attachment). Mr. Osborne noted the kit was developed by the Stewardship Education Subcommittee to help preserve knowledge about DOE's activities at the Oak Ridge Reservation and residual contamination that will be left in place following completion of Environmental Management Program activities at the site. The Subcommittee targeted high school students with the kit. One goal of the kit is to make sure the legacy of involvement at Oak Ridge is transferred to the future. The Subcommittee developed five lessons, each designed to teach a particular element of stewardship. They are fully annotated lesson plans and include much background information and a video. Meeting participants viewed the video produced for the resource kit that describes to teachers the background of the kit and provides a brief overview of its use in the classroom.

Mr. Osborne further discussed lesson plans noting how goals, objectives, overviews, vocabulary, visual aids and other items assist the teachers. Teacher workshops are planned and kit updates are planned. The Oak Ridge SSAB plans to work on a stewardship video in the future.

Participants inquired about the funding for the kits, which was provided by the Oak Ridge SSAB at a cost of about \$80 per kit. They asked about the response from the educational institutions regarding the kits and whether they are being utilized in classrooms. Mr. Osborne explained they had started with Oak Ridge High School and plan to go to the Knox County school system. He noted they need to tie lessons plans to gateway indicators used by the Tennessee school system so that teachers can correlate how the kit materials tie into the subject they're teaching, be it a course in environmental science, biology, civics or history.

General Discussion Regarding Educational Outreach

Norman Mulvenon noted that having students participate on the SSABs is very important. Oak Ridge had three students participate on the SSAB this year. Rhonda McCorry noted the Paducah CAB is organizing an outreach committee and started a speakers bureau and that they want to expand their outreach efforts and improve the diversity of the board with outreach efforts. Jim Brannon of NNM commented there has been an evolution in environmental sciences and public awareness in past 10-15 years. He stated the NNM CAB is holding a community forum on Area G, a hot topic in NM, and they have been working on it for 16 months. It will address five key questions and include a display session, presentations and background, and a facilitated panel. Gerald DePoorter, Rocky Flats noted the CAB slide show and the fact that they give presentations to high schools, rotary clubs, scout troops, etc.... This has been an effective way to explain what Rocky Flats is all about, particularly with small groups.

Bob Tabor, Fernald, noted that being a closure site, there is still a job to do that a lot of Boards have not looked at. It's not the end of things once you have the waste gone. How you manage, design a program and leave a legacy education for families in your area is very important. Charles Phillips, Nevada noted the CAB roadshow that is given just before CAB public meetings, to explain what the CAB does and their purview. This can go from 15-45 minutes depending on the audience. There are three students assisting the CAB from the University of Nevada by doing a paper on public involvement as part of their studies.

Shelley Cimon, Hanford, noted the State of Oregon periodically updated a video they use as a tool to talk with organizations. Ms. Cimon chairs the Oregon State Board. She noted the Hanford meeting being held in Yakima and the use of public radio, evening sessions and massive displays. Board members man the displays. Karen Corrigan, Idaho, noted the need to work more closely with DOE in developing a joint DOE/CAB outreach program. Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen noted the need to reach high schools and middle schools. He commented the SSABs are neglecting a vital segment of the residents if they don't go to the schools. Jean Sulc, Savannah River, commented on essay contests the CAB conducts with middle schoolers and noted two educational workshops held on Plutonium and the End State Vision. She noted an additional workshop for stakeholders is being planned for HLW and implementation of Section 3116.

Public Comments

Mel Galin, Savannah, Ga.

Mr. Galin categorically disagreed with every statement Mr. Lawless made regarding the National Forum. Regarding the letter from Paul Golan, he stated there was some political smokescreen, but also an offer and he thinks you could slip a forum in there. Mr. Galin commented on the reports from the National Academy of Sciences and the need to engage the political world and the technical world in defining the issues and doing something about them. Mr. Galin stated the National Forum Outline is a terrific document, well crafted that needs a bit more precision. He stated he hoped the working group would continue to work on the national forum. Mel Galin agreed with Todd Martin's letter saying it was critically important for the chairs to be on record with a product that shows the SSABs are serious about the forum. There may be better ways to expend resources, but Mr. Galin thinks this is a good use of resources.

Perry Holcomb, North Augusta, S.C.

Mr. Holcomb welcomed the SSABs to the area. He noted he has been a member of SRS CAB for six years and was also gainfully employed at SRS for 36 years, having retired in 1996. Mr. Holcomb stated the CAB work produces successes and he hoped the SSAB Chairs would consider sharing successes. He commented that he is the Chair of Facility Disposition & Site Remediation Committee for the SRS CAB and that for his first 2 years, the number one topic was D&D. Mr. Holcomb commented that this year, D&D is not even in the top 10, therefore there must have been some success. He commented the SSABs need to put out more praise and recognition of their successes rather than dwell on the issues at hand. He commented he knows DOE would like to hear them.

Robert Pope, EPA, Region IV

Mr. Pope thanked the SSAB members, noting it is always good to see the community involved. He stated they represent their communities well. Mr. Pope encouraged the SSABs to work more on outreach to younger groups. He stated the decisions we are making are going to last for 1000s of years and impact our young people for a long time to come.

Bill Lawless, SRS

Mr. Lawless responded to Mel Galin noting the best motion the SRS CAB ever did was generated by Wade Waters that took transuranic waste from Mound only if we shipped twice as much to WIPP. He stated that if the National Forum had more concreteness, he wouldn't be so concerned.

Briefing by DAS Frank Marcinowski and Chair Discussion

Frank Marcinowski provided background information regarding his credentials. He shared some of Secretary Bodman's philosophy from a meeting held earlier in the week. He noted Secretary Bodman had previously been in private industry and had brought that commercial experience with him. There was a wide range of productivity among the companies and wide range on how folks address safety. Secretary Bodman comes from that perspective as well, he said. Mr. Marcinowski said worker safety is first and foremost in DOE minds.

Mr. Marcinowski noted an upcoming meeting on waste disposition noting that SSAB participation would be a great help for DOE and give the SSABs a better understanding of what DOE is dealing with. The DOE approach to developing disposition strategies is to work off existing baselines. Mr. Marcinowski said

DOE is going to identify any obstacles that may have developed and try to identify alternatives and additional pathways. He stated he can't predict what all the issues are going to be. The upcoming meeting is focused on LLW and MLLW.

Mr. Marcinowski provided insight on where DOE is on some of its waste strategies. He commented that all the transuranic waste had been removed from Rocky Flats. This created a significant glut in the pipeline of waste going to WIPP. DOE is hoping Idaho will be able backfill the pipeline, but between now and December, DOE will have to commit significant resources to Idaho to make that milestone happen. SRS and Hanford have a significant backlog, and DOE is hoping to empty those backlogs over the next several months, although most resources need to be directed at Idaho. Mr. Marcinowski noted that DOE is also working the TRUPACT III issue and doing its best to get that effort back on track. He stated they hope to have a container approved if not next year, then by early 2007. Mr. Marcinowski stated that Nevada has some large boxes of transuranic waste and the goal is to deinventory Nevada of legacy TRU by 2005 because in 05 DOE loses the California transportation corridor. He stated DOE is doing everything they can to address the classified material out there as well. NTS is attempting to issue an Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract to repack large packages into drums.

Regarding remote-handled transuranic waste, DOE is working with the New Mexico regulators and has a path forward. DOE is expecting to get the necessary permit modification in early 2006 and plans on shipping by the end of FY06. Oak Ridge has the most remote handled TRU in the complex and the first focus will be there, he said. When asked what kind of commitment the regulators have given on an early 2006 approval of the modification, Mr. Marcinowski replied it is more than ever previously. DOE is working to keep them prioritized on what DOE thinks is most important and not burden them with less important changes.

Mr. Marcinowski stated he would be glad to come to the SSAB Chairs meeting in October and give them a briefing on the strategy document for waste disposition. He noted DOE would be looking for public input in the fall timeframe. Jim Brannon commented on the need for early stakeholder involvement, which was echoed by Karen Corrigan. The participants discussed the need to get information in a timely manner.

Participants further discussed the waste disposition meeting in late May; the project teams formed by DOE-Headquarters to look at various issues; and prioritization of strategies, noting that LLW and Mixed LLW were not a high priority for most of the sites.

Doug Frost, DOE-Headquarters gave a brief update on End State Vision documents. He noted this effort got off track last year because of insufficient focus on public participation. Paul Golan put the brakes on and said we need to get stakeholders, field managers and HQ together to figure out how to get back on track during the October Chicago meeting that unfortunately coincided with the Chairs meeting in Hanford. The sites are working on vision documents and stakeholder input is being incorporated.

Round Robin 2: Future of the EM SSABs/ SSAB Transfers from EM to Other DOE Offices

SAVANNAH RIVER

Savannah River will eventually transition, but not for the foreseeable future. However, SR is concerned about other sites setting precedents. Savannah River would also like to see substantial public involvement in transitions and asked DOE to ensure the public is included as members of the Local Stakeholder Organizations. Savannah River hopes to improve relations with the National Nuclear Security Administration.

ROCKY FLATS

In late 2006 or early 2007, management responsibility for the DOE-retained portions of the Rocky Flats site will transfer from EM to the Office of Legacy Management. Without an EM presence, the Rocky Flats CAB will cease operations. Rocky Flats CAB members will no longer have a formal relationship with other EM SSAB members. Legacy management will establish a Local Stakeholder Organization at Rocky Flats, although organizational membership issues on the LSO have not been resolved and are a concern to the community-at-large.

OAK RIDGE

The Oak Ridge Board has no clear understanding as to what federal program will have long-term stewardship responsibility. Public involvement after any transfer remains an issue. The Board's Stewardship Committee is making sure that DOE is constructing a stewardship implementation plan, which will be based on an annotated outline provided by the SSAB. The Stewardship Committee of the Oak Ridge SSAB serves informally as a Citizens Board for Stewardship and will continue to do so until the Oak Ridge SSAB completes its mission and is disbanded. Responsibility for newly generated waste at the Y-12 Plant will transfer from EM to NNSA in October. Responsibility for newly generated waste at Oak Ridge National Laboratory will transfer from EM to Science when all the issues are worked out.

NORTHERN NEW MEXICO

The Los Alamos Site Manager has to tell the NNM CAB if he wants to fund it. Some State employees today are funded by a statement of agreement in principle. The Site manager has to decide whether to fund the CAB or them or someone else. The Board is curious to know NNSA's official public participation policy. NNM offered the following five questions:

- At transfer, can we look at more than just EM issues (increase scope)?
- Budget – will it go up, go down, or stay the same?
- What is NNSA's concept & approach toward EM?
- What is NNSA's position on SSABs?
- Will NNSA support other oversight groups (e.g., EEG, DOE OB)?

NEVADA

Transfer of DOE/NSO EM Program to NNSA

Nevada is a National Nuclear Security Administration facility. Therefore, environmental restoration and waste management activities are proposed for transfer to NNSA by FY 2006

CAB'S BOTTOM LINE

Regardless of where the EM work is placed, a need will remain for stakeholder involvement. It is essential that up-front planning take place to ensure that the CAB will continue to be a viable voice for the community in ongoing EM projects: Low-Level Waste, Mixed Low-Level Waste, Transuranic/Mixed Transuranic Waste, Industrial Sites, Underground Test Area, and Soils. Current Acting Assistant Manager for Environmental Management and DDFO support the transition of the CAB to NNSA, which was voiced during a meeting on April 11, 2005. The Board received assurance that the NTS CAB will remain in place to address EM issues. Per NNSA Manager: "We absolutely want to continue. We want the Nevada CAB be the best CAB possible, and we want the transition to be seamless." The Board will continue to work with the DDFO to address issues related to charter, future interaction with EM SSABs, etc.

Path Forward – Outstanding Issues

Will there be a national approach to officially recognize operations for those CABs being transferred; e.g., charter, bylaws, etc. – or will each CAB be chartered locally?

Will the EM SSABs and DOE EM support ongoing involvement of CABs being transitioned to other organizations?

NTS believes that it is essential for the CAB to maintain its current national presence with EM SSAB activities, including semi-annual Chairs' meetings, conference calls, workshops, national forums, etc. Because of Nevada's role in waste disposition for the DOE complex, it is important to maintain the existing link to EM and its stakeholder involvement initiatives.

IDAHO

The INEEL CAB is not undergoing a transfer from EM. They do however echo concerns of NNM about who they can give advice to. Some of the cleanup projects onsite are being done under Nuclear Energy with EM money and DOE-ID has suggested that the Board is not chartered to comment on these projects. The Board's position is that if the projects are paid for by EM, it is immaterial what facilities are used and what DOE office "owns" the facilities. The Board hopes DOE has learned from past mistakes and will not limit the Boards.

FERNALD

The FCAB's concerns about transfer from EM to LM include effective completion and cleanup, transition of public participation, and LTSM roles at Fernald. Many projects and requirements have not been completed and the FCAB wants to be sure EM completes them safely and effectively prior to the transfer of the site to LM. A recently drafted Site Transition Plan for Fernald outlines several areas of uncertainty regarding the final completion of the site. Currently, there are no permanent storage locations for Silos 1 and 2 wastes. Removal and packaging of waste from Silo 3 just began and will continue through most of 2005. The final placement of soils and closure of the On-Site Disposal Facility still needs to be completed and DOE must closeout procedures and documentation for four of five Records of Decision.

The FCAB would like the transition of public participation responsibilities from EM to LM to better match other aspects of the transition process. This would mean basing the end of the FCAB on meeting certain cleanup goals and continuing EM public participation past the completion of the closure contract. The final Community Involvement Plan is not anticipated until after the current date to disband the FCAB. The original draft of this document is somewhat vague and the LM vision of post closure public participation has not been clearly defined. Many FCAB members have been involved in the organization for more than a decade. The FCAB believes there is value in retaining institutional knowledge of the organization through completion and transition of the site. Although Congress specified that an LSO should be in place at closure sites six months prior to physical completion, there is not a clear timeline for establishing an LSO at Fernald. The FCAB believes it would be most effective to have a clear period of transition from the FCAB to the LSO, rather than assuming that the LSO would pickup where the FCAB ends without any overlap or communication between the two groups.

There are four major roles to be played at post-closure Fernald; LTSM, aquifer restoration, records management, and natural resources/land management. Although LM is responsible for filling these roles, no contracting process is underway for determining who will fill them. The FCAB believes public input should be considered in defining their scope of work. LM has not specified what roles these contractors would play in public participation. Because DOE presence at the site will be minimal, the community sees great value in having the contractors interact with the public.

DISCUSSION

Audrey Berry of the Office of Legacy management congratulated the Boards for a job well done in the past, now and in the future. She briefly discussed the establishment of LSOs. Congress decided to pass legislation that speaks to establishing LSOs. A lot of the language is up in the air in this legislation. She noted the letter from the Colorado delegation was very positive. The part of the Congressional letter that is so positive is to include participation of others-more than just local officials. Ms. Berry stated she thinks DOE will see distinct LSOs at the various sites. At Mound, local elected officials will be very interested and involved, however this won't be the case for all sites. Ms. Berry noted this is an ongoing process and DOE LM is committed to public involvement.

Karen Corrigan noted the underlying reason for FACA and Sunshine Laws are the same and suggested the SSAB current structure should remain. Ms. Berry noted that FACA is very strict and that although LM wants to adopt some of the premises of FACA, they don't want to be chained to it.

Sandra Waisley explained that the proposed transitions between offices are not yet approved by Congress and DOE may not get word on the transitions until October. When asked if DOE has plans for the transitions if approved by Congress, it was noted that there is a transition plan signed between NNSA and EM for Nevada. Ms. Nielson explained how DOE is organized. The NNSA half of DOE has its own legislation and reports to the Secretary. The current SSAB charter is through EM. NNSA will have to charter its own boards and this would probably have to be a Secretarial Charter. NNSA has no advisory boards at this point. The Chairs asked what would be the best mechanism for them to influence NNSA to develop policy and adopt boards. Melissa Nielson suggested working with site managers and Alice Williams of NNSA.

Sandra Waisley assured the SSABs that DOE has had information transfer with LM and NNSA. She participated in extensive briefings with Tony Carter and Mike Owens. DOE does not want to lose all that knowledge. Ms. Waisley commented that DOE is trying to make this transition work and figure a way to get all the expertise aligned properly.

Kerry Trammell noted that independence of thought and process, objectivity and lack of conflict of interest were reasons he got involved with the Oak Ridge SSAB. He stated that with the LSO, it would be impossible for those type principles to be established and enforced. The tipping fee at Oak Ridge is prime example. Audrey Berry noted that Congress has mandated that DOE have local elected officials; however not all officials are as interested as some appear to be. She also noted that the LSO will not have to wrestle with the tremendous issues that the SSABs have because remedy will be complete. The main role will be public involvement.

Karen Corrigan closed the session by noting that she has never seen anything as well organized as the SSABs. She urged DOE not to “throw the baby out with the bath water.” She commented that there is no better structure than the SSABs.

Public Comments

Ken Korkia commented that the Advisory Boards were first established following a recommendation by the Keystone group. He commented that their recommendation didn’t take an act of congress to establish the boards. He suggested that the SSABs may want to develop a recommendation as an advisory board to be able to continue its work together in the future.

Friday, April 29

Consideration of National Forum Structure

Norman Mulvenon provided several modifications to the National Forum outline. The first page was deleted; the term “forum” was changed to “workshop” globally, and the list of suggested independent facilitators was deleted. Mike Schoener polled the boards and asked for one vote per board regarding its support for the sending the National Workshop outline. All nine boards supported the outline.

Jim Brannon offered executive level correspondence regarding the following two recommendations to Secretary Bodman:

- The Secretary of Energy should direct the offices and agencies where former Environmental Management sites will be transferred to develop policies establishing local advisory boards and other public participation opportunities similar to those that currently exist within EM.
- The Department of Energy should develop a mechanism whereby the local advisory boards, regardless of their affiliation within DOE, can continue to meet in a national setting to discuss issues of common concern and to share lessons learned.

Again, the boards were polled regarding their support for such a letter to Secretary Bodman and all were in agreement. Following consideration by the individual boards, the SSABs will transmit the recommendations with signatures from all Board Chairs that gain approval from their SSAB.

Planning for Future Chairs Meetings/Workshops

Idaho offered to host the fall Chairs meeting pending approval by its board in May. It was noted that Frank Marcinowski should present the waste disposition strategies during this meeting. There was not much energy for an SSAB workshop at this time.

DOE Organizational Updates

Sandra Waisley provided the following update on the DOE-HQ organization:

- Jessie Roberson left DOE and Paul Golan acted as Assistant Secretary through February.
- The position of Assistant Secretary for EM is now vacant

- Charlie Anderson was appointed Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary. He was the Acting Chief Operations Officer (COO) and the Project Leader for WIR. He replaces Paul Golan who is moving to the Office of Radioactive Waste Management.
- Mike Weiss was the Acting COO but is leaving in May, therefore the COO position is now vacant. Inez Triay left HQ to go back to Carlsbad. She was the previous COO. Patty Bubar is the Acting Deputy COO
- Mark Frei is the DAS for Business Operations
- Jim Fiori of EM 20 is now the A76 Study Manager
- Sandra Waisley is the Director for Cleanup Technologies
- Melissa Nielson is the Acting Director for Internal/External Coordination
- Doug Frost will be appointed the new Designated Federal Officer for the SSABs

Ms. Waisley discussed the A76 competitive outsourcing study. She noted that no office in DOE is safe from competitive outsourcing studies. This study is a 12-18 month study, which includes data collection; development of a Request for Proposal; a competition and selection. Ms. Waisley led the feasibility review to determine if there would be a study. Data collection is complete and a draft RFP will be out in May. This is when the DOE employees will see all the work activities to be potentially competed in the marketplace. They will have the opportunity to review and provide comment. A final RFP will be out in August. Ms. Waisley speculated that this will be very disruptive for EM. She noted one of 16 direct reports to her has found a new job and three more employees are seeking other job opportunities to escape A76. She mentioned that DOD's experience with A-76 studies indicate that 33-50% of employees will leave before the award comes out. There is an aggressive buyout strategy ongoing. Ms. Waisley noted that the government generally wins 85 percent of these type competitions. She stated that if Congress approves the 2006 budget request, that beginning October 1, DOE will have to decrease from 300 employees to 275 at Headquarters even without A76. She surmised even some of the Senior Executives will have to be reassigned or be demoted.

When questioned if A76 was complex-wide, Ms. Waisley responded yes, one decision will be made for the entire complex, although they made sure Fernald and Rocky Flats would not be impacted and not included in the study. Board members questioned how much the government was spending and how much they would actually save. They questioned if productivity and morale was taken into account. It was noted that very few mergers and acquisitions are successful.

Ms. Waisley also briefly discussed the DOE acquisition strategy. The EM Top-to-Bottom review identified two areas EM needs to work on. DOE needs to improve contract management and implement long term integrated strategy. Three years ago, the processes for contract acquisition were managed separately as an informally related process rather than an integrated process. Performance standards were applied inconsistently as a result. Ms. Waisley discussed five guiding principles: 1) to unbundled cleanup work from other DOE ongoing missions and separate R&D and infrastructure from cleanup work; 2) to reevaluate or renegotiate contracts to shorten schedules and accelerate risk reduction; 3) to promote small business and 8A firms; 4) to modify or recompile EM contracts as needed to accelerate risk reduction and improve performance; and 5) to create a Contract Management Advisory Council.

Ms. Cimon noted that Hanford is struggling to award any contract that's not protested and asked if there is a plan to develop contracts that are more bullet-proof. This comment was noted and Ms. Waisley did say that these protests were not expected.

Ms. Waisley also discussed the FY06 Budget and referred to slides presented for the recent EM Congressional Caucus. The EM Vision is to deliver real risk reduction and environmental cleanup that is safe for the workers, protective of environment, and respectful of the taxpayer. The vision is to deliver cleanup that this country expects and deserves. She noted that DOE is on course to meet its objectives. Investments have resulted in accelerated risk reduction, site closures, and payoff for all Americans. Ms. Waisley discussed how DOE is delivering results across the DOE complex and shared the EM Corporate Performance Measures. Ms. Waisley concluded by stating DOE must stay true to the strategy by

continuing to improve safety and performance, seeking new opportunities to reduce risk and complete cleanup and address its challenges.

Ms. Waisley also discussed the EM FY06 budget structure and shared slides regarding the DOE request for the individuals sites. Currently, it is difficult to find the total funding for a particular site. She provided a summary slide by office of the 2006 budget request and noted the various decreases for each site. Ms. Waisley noted that DOE is developing the 2007 budget, which will be provided in June and go to the Office of Management & Budget (OMB) on September 6. OMB will look at it and they will get it pasted back around November. It will go back to OMB and be rolled out in February. There are always three budget years being worked at once, she said.

Public Comment

Dave Dollins, Paducah

Mr. Dollins commented that DOE really can't speak about the contracting issues at Paducah because they are procurement sensitive, but he noted all protests have been withdrawn on the cleanup contract.

Perry Holcomb, SRS

Mr. Holcomb clarified that F Canyon is really under going deactivation and not decommissioning. He stated there is an unknown quantity of plutonium in the canyon and decommissioning is in the early planning stages at SR. Helen Belencan gave a presentation on Tuesday evening to his committee and noted Hanford problems with canyon decommissioning. He also commented that he hoped everyone realizes that DOE is utilizing its resources and if it weren't for one particular site, Rocky Flats would not close in 2006.

Carla Sanda, Nevada

Ms. Sanda commented on concerns with the LSOs and wanted to reflect and provide encouragement. She said that at Nevada, although EM is going to NNSA, NTS is also responsible for cleanup of other test sites not in Nevada, including sites in Alaska, Colorado, New Mexico and Mississippi. NTS is working well with LM. NTS has been working with Audrey Berry on transfer and thinking about stakeholder involvement and taking into consideration the value of those stakeholders. This is being done in joint public transition meetings. She noted her confidence in the fact that there really is accountable, transparent care and responsible transition.

Mel Galin, Savannah River

Mr. Galin stated the SSABs had an excellent meeting and have all done a great job. He was very pleased that all of the CABs supported the National Forum and wished to offer a number of action items related to carrying forward the National Forum or Workshop. He stated that in November the nine SSABs wrote to DOE and said that they recommend that a National Forum be held to produce technically sound, fiscally responsible, politically acceptable, sustainable and comprehensive solutions to DOE's system wide waste and material disposition challenges. Additionally, it was stated that the Forum should be organized and administered by an entity independent of DOE. He offered the following comments:

Action Item: Select An Independent Organization To Organize And Administer The National Workshop.

- We have all heard that DOE is studying all of the disposition matters and is working on reports. That is as it should be. DOE should provide information and resources to the National Workshop. My really simple view of a National Workshop is that its initial purpose is to hear first-rate speakers and to exchange views among knowledgeable professionals (and this include CAB leaders and members) concerning matters of national importance. I suggest that among the attendees should be members of the scientific community, political community and the academic, government, industry and not-for-profit sectors.

Action Item: Decide The Participants And Invitees : Who Should Attend The National Workshop.

- In my estimation, it will be a major accomplishment just to find out what people believe and to understand and consider current thinking about all of the significant programs and plans that deal with the stabilization and disposal of DOE waste.
- A thoroughly crafted list of the matters that are of highest priority of the CABs should be made for use in planning the National Workshop.

Action Item: Establish An Agenda Committee For The National Workshop

- As stated by Todd Martin during a conference call: "It is critically important for the Chairs to be on record with a product that shows we have put thought into this and are serious." Mr. Galin stated he knows that Todd will be very pleased to hear that this is what the Chairs have done.
- In my view, there is no question of the need for a National Forum/Workshop (as agreed by all the CABs). It is not going to be easy to come to an agreement with DOE on all the Workshop matters. Consequently, it is important that the Workshop be administered by a prestigious, independent organization that can command the attention of the leaders of each of the organizations that impact the DOE waste problems and plans, such as Congress, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the EPA, the State governments, the leading scientific and engineering groups and all other relevant policy makers. If there is to be a National Workshop, let's do it right!

Action Item: Establish The Location For The National Workshop.

- The location should be in Washington, D. C., because, otherwise, the important senior officials are unlikely to attend.
- DOE's waste disposition problems are largely system engineering matters (overlaid with political, legal and fiscal issues). System engineers follow three magical steps: First -- Understand the problem. Second -- Plan what is needed. Third -- Take action.
- The objective of the National Workshop is to understand necessary information in order to produce values, principals, and priority setting criteria as guides to common sense solutions to disposition challenges, as stated in the document you have discussed and approved.

He wished the SSABs the best of good fortune in holding a National Workshop that will produce the information needed in order to do the planning that will support strong and positive actions in a timely and cost-effective way. Everyone will then be happy. He stated it was with some trepidation that he made an offer of assistance by the National Conference on the Advancement of Research (NCAR). This is a 58-year old, not-for-profit organization with national and international standing. Mr. Galin is the Executive Secretary of NCAR that was established in 1947 based on the work of Vanderver Bush, the science adviser to FDR. NCAR has access to people at the top levels in Congress, the White House, State Capitols, and overall in the scientific, academic and government communities. By coincidence, an NCAR officer is also a senior manager in DOE. He concluded stating there is no question about the need for a National Forum and it is not going to be easy to come to agreement with DOE. The SSABs need an organization that commands prestige to pull it off.

Gerri Flemming, Savannah River

Ms. Flemming stated she wanted to say how much Savannah River was thrilled the SSABs were able to meet here. She thanked Sandra Waisley for involvement with the SSABs and wished her a fond farewell. She also welcomed Melissa Nielson and Doug Frost.

Bill Lawless, Savannah River

Mr. Lawless stated he planned to write a letter against the national workshop forum as presently constituted since he stated it is not in the best interest of SR and his CAB. He agreed with Paul Golan's letter and stated it was not a good plan, not a good idea, and he would do everything he could to oppose it.

Susan Leckband, Hanford

Ms. Leckband thanked Sandra Waisley for her candor. She stated it was clear she has support for SSABs and has done positive actions on behalf of the SSABs. She commented that Ms. Waisley continued to be a model of civility. She also welcomed the new DOE officials working with the SSABs.

Jim Brannon, Northern New Mexico

Mr. Brannon stated the SSAB Chairs may want to consider drafting recommendations that addresses challenges in the DOE acquisition strategy at their next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.